

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Proposition 1E Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Grant Program

Stormwater Flood Management Grant, Round 1, 2010-2011

Applicant	Placer County Flood Control and Water Conservation District	Amount Requested	\$2,919,873
Proposal Title	American River Basin IRWM Stormwater Flood Management Grant Proposal – Antelope Creek Improvement Project	Total Proposal Cost	\$5,839,747

PROPOSAL SUMMARY

The Project would reduce bank overtop flooding in Roseville and unincorporated Placer County by construction of two on-channel embankments or weirs with culverts sized to reduce peak flood flows downstream. The Project will provide regional flood control benefits to critically-impacted areas of Roseville and unincorporated Placer County; improve an existing recreational corridor through the enhancement of an existing multi-purpose public train system; increase groundwater recharge in shallow aquifers, restore creek and riparian habitat, and improve water quality in Clover Valley Reservoir.

PROPOSAL SCORE

Criteria	Score/ Max. Possible	Criteria	Score/ Max. Possible
Work Plan	15/15	Economic Analysis – Flood Damage Reduction and Water Supply Benefits	3/12
Budget	4/5		
Schedule	1/5	Water Quality and Other Expected Benefits	3/12
Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures	4/5	Program Preferences	8/10
Total Score (max. possible = 64)			38

EVALUATION SUMMARY

Work Plan

The Work Plan criteria is fully addressed and supported by thorough and well-presented documentation and logical rational. Similar to the other American River Basin applications, the Work Plan contains an introduction that includes the goals and objectives of the Project and their relationship to the adopted IRWM Plan. In addition, the introduction contains a tabulated overview of the Project, which includes an abstract and project status. Also, included is a regional map showing the relative Project location and a brief discussion of the Project's synergies and linkages among the American River Basin projects. Each proposed task is of adequate detail and completeness so that it is clear that the project can be implemented. The Work Plan includes quarterly, annual, and final reports among others as work item submittals. In addition, the Work Plan includes a list of permits and their status including California Environmental Quality Act

compliance when applicable. Although only at an approximate 10% level, plans and project description details are consistent with the design tasks included in the Work Plan. Similarly, the submitted scientific and technical information supports the feasibility of the proposed work items. Overall, the tasks collectively implement the Proposal and consist of a standalone Project. The Project is consistent with the Basin Plan.

Budget

The budget for the Project has detailed cost information as described in Attachment 4 and the costs are considered reasonable but the supporting documentation is not fully provided or lacks detail. Table 3 “Land Purchase/Easement” shows costs for land acquisition, but there was no discussion as to how the costs are estimated. Table 4 shows costs for “geotechnical sub” at an hourly rate of \$190/hour with 670 hours. This totals totaled \$127,300.00, but only \$50,000 is shown. Table 11 illustrates contingencies are 15% of construction costs for Phase 1 and 2 and 20% of construction costs for Phase 3. However, the reviewer was unable to calculate the construction costs used to generate the contingencies shown.

Schedule

The Schedule is consistent and reasonable but is limited to a score of 1 as it does not demonstrate a readiness to begin construction until May 16, 2013 after the anticipated award date of October 1, 2011.

Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures

The criterion is fully addressed but is not supported by thorough documentation or sufficient rationale. The Project Goals, Desired Outcomes, Output and Outcome Indicators, Measurement Tools and Methods, and Targets are lumped together in a table. This makes it unclear which criteria are meant to work together. Furthermore, the goals to increase Placer County Water Agency’s water system operational stability and to increase groundwater recharge are not addressed with Outcome Indicators or other measurement criteria.

Economic Analysis – Flood Damage Reduction (FDR) and Water Supply Benefits

Only low levels of FDR and water supply benefits can be realized through this Proposal, as demonstrated by the analysis and supporting documentation. Total net present value (NPV) of costs is \$4.667 million. FDR claimed benefits are \$0.363 million. Water supply benefits claimed are \$0.573 million, so total FDR and water supply benefits together are about 20 percent of costs. The water supply benefits appear to be estimated incorrectly. The avoided desilting costs should be saved in years 20 and 40 but subtracted, not saved, in year 30.

Economic Analysis – Water Quality and Other Expected Benefits

Only low levels of water quality and other benefits can be realized through this Proposal, as demonstrated by the analysis and supporting documentation. Water quality and other benefits claimed and monetized are recreational (\$0.147 million NPV), about 3 percent of costs.

Program Preferences

The proposal demonstrates with a significant degree of certainty that a number of Program Preferences can be achieved by implementing the proposed project. Thorough documentation with breadth and magnitude is provided for the following Program Preferences: Include Regional Projects or Programs, Practice Integrated Flood Management, Protect Surface and Groundwater Quality, and Expand Environmental Stewardship.